

Southern Standard.

W. D. CHAPMAN, Publisher and Proprietor.

COLUMBUS:

Saturday, February 9, 1851.

To the Reader.

Our friends at a distance must remember we forward no paper without the money accompanies the order—this is a rule from which we will not depart. Our friends at a distance must remember this rule.

It is rumored here that Gov. Quitman has resigned—it is probably true. The hon. John I. Guion, President of the Senate will discharge the executive functions. Gov. Guion is an able man, a sound lawyer and true to the doctrine of State Rights.

It is pretty well settled now that col. T. H. Benton, of Missouri, is to be the free soil candidate and successor of President Fillmore. This will be a bitter pill for Gen. Foote, and the submission men of Mississippi to swallow. Gentlemen besely engaged erecting national platforms and forming national alliances, had as well reflect a little. Time may cool your patriotism.

The Monroe Democrat

has recently changed hands by the retirement of Mr. Caldwell, and the installation of Dr. M. Deavenport, who enters upon the discharge of his duty in an able and manly salutatory to his readers. We most cordially extend the hand of fellowship to the new incumbent, and wish him success in his new sphere of action.

To Professional men and Merchants.

The Standard is a good medium through which to circulate information. We are prepared to do work in a superior style, and we can accommodate a limited number of advertising friends. Those who desire our services can find ready attention and prompt compliance with their commands by application at this office.

To our Patrons and Friends.

We have no apologies to offer for lack of news items and diversified reading matter. The fault is not ours. The Standard is without an exchange list as yet, and it is probable that three or four weeks will elapse ere one of practical value can be obtained. The Standard must reach the offices throughout the State and the South before we can expect the common courtesy of the press to be extended to it. This requires time.—When a list shall have been obtained, it is hoped good use will be made of it. To our friends in this city who have extended to us the use of their papers, we return our thanks.

The programme—Constructive Right.

It is fair to presume that a programme that meets with the "constructive assent of every body" South of Mason and Dixon's line, with "but few exceptions," is, to say the least of it, rather a popular programme. The "constructive assent" may be in its nature a primitive one, and if so, constructively true. But an assent yielded to direct declarations admits of no constructive diversity of "assent" but a primitive one. If the Republican yields to the resolutions of 1798-9, a primitive construction, it will differ with the Standard in nothing so far as they go. Concluding that the Republican does yield to those resolutions a constructive assent not corresponding with that of the Standard, it is invited to give its construction of them. Upon the plain, simple, clear and pointed language of the resolutions the Standard relies for its defence and its position.

There is a large, and we are pleased to say, growing party in the South, and in this State particularly, that are disinclined to believe in constructive rights—it is a feature new of history, that the constructive partisans have brought destruction to our very borders. It is the constructive partisans that let California into the Union through a breach made in the federal constitution. The constructive partisans filched from the federal treasury ten million of dollars to pay Texas for slave territory to make a future free State out of. It was constructive partisans that emancipated the property of the citizens of the States if they deposited it in the federal district for sale. Constructive partisans deny that the slaveholder with his property has been excluded from entering the new territories of the Union on equal terms with the non-slaveholder. Constructive partisans are now ready to erect a new national platform, subject to as many constructions as the exigency of the times requires—to suit all latitudes and all opinions and creeds—but finally to be determined by the majority, and acquiesced in by a Southern minority.

The Republican no doubt is primitively a constructive organ—the administration organ, for it may be argued from Mr. Fillmore's late Texas message, his votes in Congress, and his Buffalo and Gayle letters, that he is both constructive and destructive of Southern rights and interests.

Position of Parties.

What a theme is this now that a lawless majority stands with uplifted arm ready to strike away the only barrier that stays the flood of oppression and fanaticism? Duty indicates the course of the South, but the prejudices and the grovelling interests of the ambitious men of this our day, prompt them to study the means best calculated to elevate themselves and sacrifice the guaranteed rights of the South and State sovereignty, rather than range themselves in a position of offering security now and hereafter. Philosophers, wits and moralists have exhausted the records of history and the field of fancy in pursuit of apposite illustrations of the fate of those who, for cowardice, revenge, stupidity or any equally unworthy view, have yielded themselves up to the guidance of their foes, and found "too late that men betray. The ass that went hunting with the lion, exacting in advance a promise that the division should be fair and equitable, is of such—and, equal to this is the instance of the unmarried goose, who accepted the addresses of the fox, on his promising to take care of the goslings. He complied with his promise—of course. The horse too, took a rider to hunt his enemy, the stag; the horses' rider clings to his seat still. The man too built his house on a quicksand to be near an oyster-bed—which was such a consideration. Equal to these in folly is the plea put up by Southern men to continue a national partnership in party ties and party intrigue for the purpose of controlling the executive patronage and dividing the plunder of federal offices. The fate of the goslings will be that of those who hereafter trust to the promises of national parties and two-sided national platforms. Will Southern democrats hereafter trust themselves and the interests of the South upon any national platform unless they obtain in advance, the clear and undeniable recognition of all the rights they now contend for? Let them reflect for what principle they contended in the late Presidential campaign, and let them recollect the expedition given to the country of the meaning of the celebrated Nicholson letter by its distinguished author. And what of the whig party, and of the principles advocated by them in that campaign? They contended ably and as the sequel proved efficiently, for they succeeded, that the position claimed for Gen. Cass and his advocates, was not the true reading of his letter, and they denounced his advocates in unmeasured terms, and the principles claimed were branded everywhere as free-soil abolitionism. A singular change has been wrought in the minds of many Southern whigs, for they are found almost the exclusive

advocates of the principles of the Nicholson letter, as explained by Gen. Cass, in the Southern States. But let that pass.

The immediate business in hand is to point at the Position of Parties in Mississippi, and to remove with boldness the thin veil, demagogues have raised between themselves and the people in order to conceal the objects they have in view. Really, there are but two parties in this State. There are outsiders hanging upon the skirts of both parties, and then there are those who from prudential or other motives, swing clear of each organized party, and contend for some impracticable position. With such we have nothing to do, hence our remarks do not apply to them.

The conservative party, and it is to that party this paper yields allegiance, stands upon the sovereign right of the people of the confederacy to demand of the federal authority protection of life, liberty, and of property wherever that authority is paramount and supreme for such purposes. For instance, the constitution recognizes the property right of the master in his slave and whenever a citizen of any one of the several States shall come within the range of its authority, it is bound to protect him in the enjoyment of his property and his liberty. This duty of the federal government has been enforced by a powerful intellect as follows:

"Having for its object the more perfect protection and promotion of the safety and rights of each and all, it is bound to protect by their united power, the safety, the rights, the property, and the interests of the citizens of all, wherever its authority extends. That was the object for conferring whatever power and authority it has; and if it fails to fulfill that, it fails to perform the duty for which it was created. It is enough for it to know that it is the right, interest, or property of a citizen of one of the States to make it its duty to protect it whenever it comes within the sphere of its authority, whether in the territories, on the high seas, or anywhere else. Its power and authority were conferred on it not to establish or to abolish property or rights of any description, but to protect them. To establish or abolish belongs to the States, in their separate sovereign capacity—the capacity in which they created both the general and their separate State governments. It would be, then, a total and gross perversion of its power and authority to use them to establish or abolish slavery, or any other property of the citizens of the United States, in the territories. All the power it has, in that respect is to recognize as property there whatever is recognized as such by the authority of any one of the States, its own being but the united authority of each and all of the States, and to adopt such laws for its regulation and protection as the STATE OF THE CASE MAY REQUIRE.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon this point; it is so manifest and clear that further labor to enforce its applicability and justness would be deemed superfluous by the intelligent reader.

Those who favored the recent meeting of the State legislature hinged their hopes upon the assembling of a convention of the People that the question of protection of all the property of all the people of all the States should be fairly brought to the notice of the federal government, thus rendering at one blow all excuse by the North for a denial of justice to the South. Believing that our brothers of the North would give quick ear and ready assent to the voice of a sovereign people expressed through the sovereign channel, than to any action of any legislature, because they are supposed to represent party rather than the will of the People, we have advocated a convention by the people of the State. Another reason influencing our action is to be found in this fact: If the Northern members of Congress deny the slave owner protection in the enjoyment peacefully of his slave property in the territories of Utah and New Mexico, then it may be considered as a fixed fact, that slave owners do not stand in the same relation to the protecting arm of federal power as that of his more fortunate neighbor; that is, he is not an equal, consequently not deserving either care or protection. But again—a denial to protect slave property in the territories by Congress will show that the North has been sincere, and what is equally important, it will show the South that the late compromise measures—one alone excepted, and that a clause of the federal constitution nullified by State legislation—are as compromise measures, wholly, utterly worthless.

Good whigs cannot object to this demand for protection for the time is within the memory of school-children when it was the Alpha and Omega of their faith. Southern men cannot object to this demand for it is a clear right, and without it, they are not equal in privileges with their Northern brethren, and of course not their equals. Good democrats cannot oppose it, for it is they who claim *par excellence* to be the party of progress and equality of rights and a community of equals. Who then, pray, is there to object? There is objection. Singular it is not, however, but it is a singular party, nevertheless. It is recognized as the Union party for "short," but it is, as a famous statesman once said of another party, "bound together by the cohesive power of public plunder." It is the Union party, and in the name of heaven, why, and for what purposes? That question we propose to answer.

This Union party is like the unmarried goose, or like the horse, or the man that built the house, but above all very like the ass with the pendants. It is determined to hunt with the lion again, and as of old it will demand in advance a promise to divide equally the game. It must have a National platform, and it must have a National ticket, and it must have the doctrine of non-intervention as now explained by the North and Messrs. Cass, Clay, Fillmore et al *en masse*, because without these prerequisites, the Union would not be of value sufficient to defend it, and the National platform of which sufficient to hold the demagogues who are preparing themselves to mount it even in this congressional district. A platform of national construction in this sort of weather and in this climate would very much resemble Gabriels shirt—it would not afford to its defenders cloth enough to keep their patriotism warm even in the sunny South.

But the question arises, what demands the South will make and what promises exact of the North? In justice to those who are willing to abide by the late action of Congress we are ready to hear them assert their acquiescence but will acquiesce secure the South against further Northern encroachment? Admitting for the present that it will, they cannot object to those less easy of belief than themselves making a demand on Congress to protect to the extent of its legitimate power the property of their fellow-citizens wherever its authority is supreme for such a purpose. Nor can they claim that those who insist upon such recognition and protection, that they are disturbers of the peace of the country or agitators for civil purposes. It is a demand of a simple guaranteed right, and the denial of that right either by Congress or the advocates of the late acts of Congress, admit that property right in slaves is a property right unrecognized by the constitution and therefore not a subject requiring protection.

Again—these national Union men may object to a demand for protection on the ground that the North will deny that Congress possesses the power of protection. We meet them here with the fact that the North has claimed for Congress the power to exclude slavery from any territory, and that it has exercised that power by direct legislation in one instance, and twice indirectly by the intervention of its action. If it possesses the power of excluding, and the Southern Union men generally deny its authority in the premises—how can

they condescend with the North, and mount a platform constructed by national men when they are not permitted to stand upon it as equals? Because if they are denied protection in the enjoyment of their property upon the soil of which they are the joint and equal owners, they are surely not equal, and if not equals, what are they? The "enduring," "compromising," "acquiescing" men in connection with the "national Unionists" can answer these points at their leisure.

As incident to these points it is proper to bring into view the game of the national Unionists, and expose their hands. Those who opposed the meeting of the legislature did so generally, because they saw indication everywhere exhibited of a settled determination to brush from existence old party ties. They discovered that the people were coming into the field to take the direction of this Southern question, and that the old lacks of party, the old grannies in politics, the flaccid and soulless old hulk that had pinned their hopes to party slogans as the anchor that was to save them from forgetfulness, were to be cut adrift from the direction of affairs. Seeing this—and continued intercourse of days had taught them that the people once aroused the days of their rule were numbered—they set to preparing a national platform, and as auxiliary to this, in advance, they denounced all who opposed them and favored the convening the legislature, as agitators and disunionists. They endeavored to poison the mind of the people against those who only asserted that they had equal rights as citizens in this confederacy, & that they but desired to exercise the natural, inherent and lawful means for their promulgation. This opposition sprang from patriotism no more devoted to the preservation of the Union than it was sincere in regard to the devotion they tendered the compromise plan. It is a singular fact that most of these Union compromisers denounced the whole plan as iniquitous and unjust, and what is equally singular, some of these very men are now its most ardent defenders, declaring it is just and that the South got all she was entitled to. They never explain how it is, or by what process it was, that measures six months since were iniquitous have been so modified by time as to be rendered immaculately holy. The legislature met and a constitutional convention is the result of its action. The Unionists declare war against any proposed action by the convention that shall have for its object the righting of the South or demanding protection for the property of her citizens in the territories of the Union.

We shall in future numbers of the STANDARD show beyond the power of rebutting testimony that the slaveholder is utterly without protection for his slaves the moment he enters the domain either of New Mexico or Utah—and that the boasted compromise defended by the Southern Union party strips the slaveholder as effectually of his legitimate constitutional rights in those territories as would the Wilmot-proviso were it in fact in operation. We shall not cease our labor when that shall have been accomplished. We shall proceed to show that the North has gained all for which it contended, and that, in the language of Mr. Webster, the Wilmot-proviso "was abandoned as useless, for what was intended to be effected by it, has been obtained through indirect, but as efficient means." We will show from the avowals of living witnesses, the current history of the times and the law, that the people of the North construe the compromise to their advantage, and that their construction of it, is the true one. Here is the issue—Union men are challenged to the discussion.

In these points it may be seen why it is that the Union men will oppose demanding through a convention of the people protection of Congress for the property of the slave owner in the territories. They are quite confident that the North will refuse it, and they are entirely confident that no national platform with protection to Southern property as a test, can be constructed. Hence the opposition to the convention. *Nois Verrons.*

A glance at the Past.

The South has reached a point in her political progress from whence a review of the Past may be usefully used as a guide and a warning monitor for the future. She has been in time past entangled in the intrigues and party schemes of the day to an extent sufficient to render her political power and her moral force entirely subservient to the overshadowing influence of party demagogues and party cliques. In the fierce scrambles for office characterizing the struggles of the past, her interest has been compromised and her rights willfully sacrificed. To preserve the union and harmony of party, and to advance and sustain national platforms, her strength has been quietly but effectually sapped, and her power used to crush her enemies and render her dependent upon the commerce of the Northern States, subservient to Northern manufacturers and artisan labor. The record of years past abounds with indubitable evidence substantiating this fact. But to be concise, we shall commence our remarks with the close of the late war with Mexico. It is known that the people of the South were about equally divided in their preferences between the two great national parties, and a division of opinion existed as to the disposition to be made of the territory acquired from Mexico. A division of sentiment existed in the South, but that we pass over to reach the issue made by Northern men with their Southern brethren. It was authoritatively announced by the North that not one foot of the acquired territory should inure to the South, and that the institution of slavery should be forever excluded. The first practical demonstration occurred in the house of representatives by annexing to the two million appropriation bill the Wilmot-proviso. This was done by Northern whigs and democrats, yet Southern democrats and whigs insisted that their respective parties North—the great national democratic party, and the great national whig party—would surely lead justly with the great national whig and the great national democratic parties South? What was the result? The South was unable to obtain from either or both these national parties votes enough to erect any plan of government for the acquired territories that would secure a chance for the slaveholder to settle in them and enjoy in peace and security his property. What justice was manifested by these great national parties and how much Southern parties gained by their adherence to them of Southern rights.

The North was appealed to by their Southern brethren, to divide the territory by the old compromise line of 36° 30'. This was refused. A Southern whig was elected President, and it was believed by some that the South would obtain her rights through his influence, his patriotism and sense of justice. He failed to do anything; in short recommended "masterly inactivity" to the South, perfectly aware that was the only way to dodge the Wilmot-proviso and maintain the nationality of parties. The democrats had a majority in both houses of Congress, and if there had existed nationality of feeling and sentiment in the democratic party North and South, it was in its power to have given governments to the territories, awarding to the South her rights, or it could have extended the Missouri compromise line of 36° 30' to the Pacific, and with this the South would have rested satisfied. The national democracy did nothing.

Adventurers and foreigners under the auspices and direction of United States army officers got up a convention in California, in open and avowed violation of law, precedent, justice or right, and framed a constitution excluding slavery. Gen. Taylor's policy of "masterly inactivity" saved the nationality of the whig party, by preventing the application of the Wilmot-proviso.

California applied for admission as a sovereign State into the confederacy. The unlawful proceedings were no hindrance to her admission according to the doctrine of the two Northern national parties—not in the least. A union of the Northern whig or democratic party with the parties of the South, could and would have excluded California. But no! There is no nationality of party when the South is to be robbed of her rights, and her institutions imperiled, and her honor or trampled on. Let a bank, a protective tariff, or any projected work of internal improvement come before Congress, and then there is nationality of feeling and sentiment; yes, nationality of party. These national parties have destroyed the South, by blinding her sons to her rights, by erecting almost impassable barriers between her public men, and arraying her people under the banner of party.

But let us take one step nearer the present time. Is there a reading man that has forgotten with what bitter invective and fierce denunciation Clay's resolutions and speech met when they reached the South? There was almost a universal shout of disapproval sent up from the South. But what did the great national parties! A few weeks later and the great national parties through a committee of thirteen reported through Mr. Clay, their chairman, bills covering the very ground previously taken by Mr. Clay. What was the result? Caucusing, intriguing, and bullying carried through both branches of Congress the measures that the South denounced as aggressive and unjust to her. Where was the national party then—did it come to the rescue of Southern rights, honor and justice? No!

Protection to slave property in the territories is denied her.

Division of those territories by the compromise line of 36° 30' is denied her.

California by adventurers and foreigners, and by direct unlawful means is shut against her.

New Mexico and Utah is lost to her.

Several hundred square miles of the soil of Texas have been purchased with federal money—two-thirds of which is wrung from the produce of Southern labor—and appropriated to free soil purposes.

Slavery itself has been attacked by the abolition of the slave trade in the federal district.

What has the South got for all this through national parties and national men? Nothing, absolutely nothing! We are pointed to the fugitive slave law as the price for what we have yielded. Great God, what a price! Look at the millions of treasure spent, and the torrents of blood that oozed from the gashed forms of the sons of the South as their true hearts ceased to pulsate, and their immortal spirits winged their way to the realm of Him who gave them life. Their bones whiten the hills and enrich the valleys they made historic by their valor and invincible heroism. Is the fugitive slave law, we care not how efficient it may be, a fitting price to offer the South as her share in the rich conquest acquired by her prowess and treasure in great part? We will look at this fugitive slave law for a moment. The constitution requires of Congress that it shall protect the citizen in the enjoyment of his property, and if that property escapes beyond the dominion of State law, the federal power is required to aid the citizen in arresting his property and thus secure to him the use and enjoyment of it. The clause is full, complete and positive, and in obedience to it, the law of 1793 was framed and passed. That law was wholly efficient, and every enforcement in a community law respecting and abiding. It was rendered worthless by State legislation. In other words, the Northern States through their legislatures nullified a positive clause of the Federal Constitution of the Union! What has Congress done? Simply remodelled the law of 1793, and by making its details more specific and annexing a penalty, it was presumed to be more efficient. Congress simply discharged its constitutional duty. There were just 31 Northern members of Congress, we believe, voted for this law out of about 160. This law is the price the North pays the South for her interest in the vast domain of the southwest.

But what right did the North sacrifice in passing the fugitive slave law? No right whatever. What right has the South gained by it? None whatever. It was an original right that existed from the foundation of the government and its assertion by Congress was in obedience alone to that right. The State legislatures by shacking the law of 1793, simply rendered the law useless and nullified a positive clause of the constitution. Now that Congress enforces this clause, the people of the South are to be quiet, that the North has been just and we should be satisfied. But who passed this fugitive slave law? Was it the North? Not at all. In the house the North cast but 31 votes for it, and it is notorious to every reading man that the South passed the law by Northern non-action or surfeance. What a subject for gratulation and rejoicing is this!

We see in this brief glance what the North has gained and the South lost by party struggles and political strife. If this is to be continued the absolute degradation of the South is inevitable. There is left for the South but one avenue to safety and independence. Her public men must cast aside the bonds of party and arouse her sons to action upon a new platform. She must strike down party barriers and unite upon positions promising indemnity for the past and security for the future.

A patent test that tests itself.

Below will be found the project of a "test" for office among the Union "enduring" men. It is worthy of note because of the rare principle it inculcates in our boasted free Republic. A few office holders gather in the basement of the capitol at Washington, and pledge themselves and their confederates not to sustain any man for any office who refuses to acquiesce in the late action of Congress. This is a novel test to say the least of it. It may be in the latitude of Washington, where that foul scheme of oppression was concocted and enacted, but that the freemen of Mississippi will obey this mandate of a few intriguing politicians acting as they no doubt are under ministerial influence time will show. No man with correct information as to what the pledge requires will ever sanction it. It is to be adopted as a test, that they who refuse to abide by the compromise, still acquiesce in the laws merely as laws, are alone to be ostracized, and that they who agree to endure the wrong and outrage without murmur, are to be sustained. This in one sense is a gag, and in another is a bid for friends to sustain the compromise. But a few days since the Republic asserted that the compromise was strictly an administration measure, and hence the inference that Mr. Fillmore will expect the officers of his administration to sustain in every feature the compromise, and no application for office, under this view of the case, will be considered unless the applicant be a supporter and defender of the compromise. This move is a ministerial bid for supporters of the compromise, and as to be expected, Gen. Foote seeks shelter under the ministerial mantle of Mr. Corwin & Co.

A pledge to support the compromise measures and to oppose any candidate for President who is against them, was signed, yesterday, by 59 members—mostly whigs. The democrats, generally, refused to sign it. It is supposed to be another movement for a Union party, at the expense of the democrats. It is all the talk. In Senate, to-day, Messrs. Clay and Foote confessed they were signers. It is understood that Messrs. Houston, Rusk, Clemens, Downes, and Gwin, Senators, and Mr. Speaker Cobb, also signed, and also forty odd

whigs, while General Cass, and the Northern democrats stand off. The scheme, it is supposed, is for a Union party, which, according to some, is exploded.—*N. Y. Herald.*

"Mr. Foote said that he was somewhat implicated in the publication by Mr. Hale. The purport of that publication was, that the signers of all parties, had united to put down the agitation of all subjects tending to renew discord, sectional strife, and all subjects having an effect to destroy the national relations, concord and union of all portions of the country. It was supposed that those were some persons in some sections who aspired to the Presidency, and others to high offices, and desired to reach those positions by keeping the agitation alive. This was merely to warn such persons, if any such did exist, that old party ties would not be adhered to, but so far as the influence and efforts of those who signed it could be exerted, such persons could not succeed even to the smallest office. The Chair said this debate was out of order. Mr. Foote said Mr. Hale was allowed to read the paper.

The Chair said the paper was read, but the Chair could not say it was out of order till it was read and applied.

Mr. Foote said the Chair had read the paper several times in print, and even in manuscript, before to-day. He would not have said a word concerning it, had he not been one of its earliest signers. The article contained his sentiments.—Such an association of distinguished men, in his opinion, could put down agitation, and he believed that they had exercised an influence already upon some through a fear of loss of official advancement. He read extracts from the circular, issued by George Wood and others of New York, and said he was not ashamed to say he was in alliance with that movement. He was sorry Mr. Hale had denounced them. They merely said, if any one desired agitation, they would not support him. We and our home will serve the Lord.

Mr. Hale was about to reply and to allude to certain meetings in the basement of the Capitol, when he was stopped by the Chair."

A friend has handed to us a copy of the proceedings of a Southern Rights Association of the students of the University of Virginia, accompanied by a well written and eloquent address. The proceedings give the names of the members of the association, among which we find the name of a son of one of our townsmen. This is encouraging—we are glad to see the young men of the South embarking in the good cause, for, if the present generation fail to assert their rights and defend their interests, the youth give token that the honor of the South and the safety of our institutions are not without their supporters and advocates.

The resolutions speak the truth boldly and pointedly, and they rebuke so signally the submission spirit abroad, that we are induced to lay them before our readers.

Resolutions.

Resolved 1. That we have witnessed with deep regret and concern the constant encroachments of the non-slaveholding States upon the rights, interests, and institutions of the South.

2. That as Southerners we are proud of our ancestry; that we love the Union of '98, of which at present there remains but "the shadow without the substance."

3. That compromises and remonstrances having failed to check the onward march of fanaticism, our only safety now seems to be in "State Action," in support of which we pledge "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

4. That the young men of the South are earnestly requested by this Association to come boldly forth and array themselves under the banner of "Justice and the Constitution."

5. That they are further requested to form similar Associations throughout the South, particularly at these Institutions, that all Southern youths are educated; and that constant communications should be encouraged between such Associations.

6. That the Corresponding Secretaries are instructed to forward copies of the Address and Resolutions to all Colleges patronized by Southerners, and to editors of papers favorable to Southern interests.

To the People of Mississippi.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, Jackson, Monday Evening, Jan. 3, 1851.

In November, 1847, I was elected your free suffrage, Governor of this State. My term of office commenced with my inauguration on the 10th of January, 1850. By the provisions of the Constitution, it will expire on the 10th January, 1852. In the middle of my term of office, and in the active discharge of its duties, I am to-day arrested by the United States Marshal of the Southern District of Mississippi, by virtue of process, originating out of charges exhibited against me in the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Louisiana, for an alleged violation of the neutrality law of 1818, by beginning, setting on foot and furnishing the means for a military expedition against the Island of Cuba.

Under these charges, the Marshal is directed to arrest me, and remove my person to the city of New Orleans, there to be tried for these alleged offences. Unconscious of having in any respect, violated the laws of the country; ready at all times to meet any charge that might be exhibited against me, I have only been anxious, in this extraordinary emergency, to follow the path of duty. As a citizen, it was plain and clear, I must yield to the law, however oppressive or unjust in my case; but, as Chief Magistrate of a sovereign State, I had also in charge her dignity, her honor, and her sovereignty, which I could not permit to be violated in my person. Resistance by the organized force of the State, while the Federal Administration is in the hands of men who appear to seek some occasion to test the strength of that Government, would result in violent contests, much to be dreaded in the present critical condition of the country.

The whole South, patient as she is under encroachment, might look with jealousy upon the employment of military force to remove a Southern Governor from the jurisdiction of his State, when it had been withheld from her citizens seeking to reclaim a fugitive slave in Massachusetts.

On the other hand, the arrest and forcible removal from the State, of her Chief Magistrate, even for an indefinite period of time, would not only be a degradation of her sovereignty, but must occasion incalculable injury and disaster to the interests of the State by the entire suspension of the Executive functions of her government. The Constitution has not provided for the removal of a Governor, except by impeachment, and it has not provided for the performance of his duties by another officer, except in the case of a vacancy. Such vacancy cannot happen while there is a Governor, though he may be a prisoner to a foreign power. Although he may be absent, and incapable of performing his duties, he is still Governor, and no person can execute his office.

It follows, therefore, that in such case, the State would practically suffer some of the evils of anarchy. The pardoning power would be lost. Officers could not be commissioned or qualified; the Great Seal of the State could not be used; vacancies in office could not be filled; fugitives from justice could not be reclaimed or surrendered; the public works, the operations of the Penitentiary, and all repairs of public buildings must stop for want of legal requisitions to defray the expenses thereof. The sale of State lands, and the location of recent grants must be suspended.

The Convention of the people, called at the last session of the Legislature, could not assemble for want of writs of election. In case of the death or resignation of the administrative officers of the State Government, these important offices, including the treasury, would be left without the superintendence or care of any authorized person. In fine, the whole Government of the State would be in confusion and great inconvenience, and perhaps irreparable injury flow from such a state of things. For all these evils there is but one remedy—That remedy is my resignation.

I therefore, fellow-citizens, now resign the high trust confided to my hands, with no feeling of personal regret, except that I could not serve you better; with no feeling of shame, for a legal requisition to defray the expenses of this step. On the contrary, although personally I fear no investigation and shun no scrutiny, I have spared no efforts consistent with self-respect to avert this result. So soon as I learned that attempts would be made, under an act of Congress of the last year, to remove me from this

State, I formally offered to the proper authorities of the United States, my pledge or security to appear in New Orleans, and meet the charges against me, so soon as my term of office should expire; and I remonstrated against the *impunity* thus about to be offered, not to myself, but to the State, in dragging away from its duties, her Chief Magistrate.

My proposition was not accepted, and my remonstrance not heeded.

It is not for me to complain. You are the aggrieved party. My course in this matter needs the approval of some of the most patriotic citizens near me. I sincerely hope, as it was dictated alone by my sense of duty to the State, it may meet the approbation of my fellow-citizens.

In thus parting from my generous constituents, it would be proper to give them an account of my stewardship during the short but interesting period that I have acted as their public servant, but the official connection between us has been so summarily and unexpectedly severed, that I must defer the grateful task to a future day.

I have but to add that during my short but exciting period of service, I have in all things striven to be faithful and true to the rights, the interests, and the honor of the State. For this, I have been abused and calumniated by the enemies of the South. Treachery and faithlessness would have secured favor and praise from the same sources.

Fellow-citizens, I now take my leave of you with gratitude for the generous support you have extended to me, and with cheerful confidence that your honor and your interests may be safely confided to the hands of the faithful and able son of Mississippi, who as President of the Senate, succeeds to my place.

JOHN A. QUITMAN.

As an instance of the duplicity of Northern members of Congress, and as indicating the shifts to which Southern submissionists are driven to sustain and uphold the late encroachments upon the South, it is only necessary to point at the pledge brought to the notice of the country by Gen. Foote in the Senate, mention of which is made in another column of the Standard of to-day. It is evident that the Northern submissionists as well as Southern national Unionists, dread a demand for justice and equality for the South. It is laid down in the pledge as traitorous to disturb the late acts of Congress. With the whole plan—the fugitive slave bill excepted—the North acquiesces in by a large majority. Cause, by it, it has gained every thing. The South should unite and demand the North protection for Southern property in the territories, it is, under this pledge, to be construed as a direct attempt to unsettle the compromise, open up the question to slavery agitation again, and jeopard the Union of these States. As an argument against the demand for protection, this is ridiculous; as an excuse, contemptible; and they who shield themselves beneath either the one or the other, swing into the contest as enemies not only to our free institutions, but as arrant cowards at heart. If the slaveholders have rights in the territories, and Congress possesses the power of protecting them and has failed to do so, it is not only an inherent right in the citizen to demand it, but they who excuse themselves on the plea that it will arouse agitation, manifest a spirit unworthy of Americans, and deserve the contempt of the world for their pusillanimity.

It is the right of freemen to contend for all that the constitution guarantees to them of political power and of civil rights. If a law has been enacted that deprives them of these rights, or any part thereof, they may demand through the organized legitimate channel, redress—and should that be denied them, they must appeal to that spirit which prompted the revolutionary sires to sever bonds found oppressive and tyrannical, or tamely submit to degradation and slavery. This is the issue and there is no escaping it.

Those who take counsel from their fears, or those who dread excitement, or those who are desirous of speculating upon the present calamities as a just infliction for past imprudence and folly, or those who form a more unworthy motive for enduring the present and past wrongs rather than exercise their natural rights, will, of course, seek excuses and piliations for failing to meet, boldly, and front to front, the evil and the evil doers. They will say the object sought is not worth the hazard: that the rights claimed are not equal to those imperiled! Such an argument is heret and the thrallened coward invariably us—such arguments make freedom slaves—was it to such arguments that the revolutionary men appealed?

Will the North resist a united demand for justice to the South? Never, never! The South hazards nothing by asserting her constitutional rights, but by acquiescing in aggression, she imperils her institutions and her liberty.

WHO ARE FOR THE UNION?—Our Union-loving friends call themselves the only true Union party, and all others who are not exactly of their way of thinking are set down as disunionists. They accuse the States Rights Party of combining with Northern fanatics to overthrow the Union, because we have not the same faith and confidence in the professions of our brethren North, and do not embrace with so much love and so highly applaud the darling offspring of free-soilism, the compromise, we are denounced as disunionists, agitators, and traitors. Because we claim the right of speaking out our opinions freely and openly, and expressing our disapprobation of the aggressive measures forced upon us by the last Congress, we are called disunionists. For trying to unite the South and presenting to the North a firm and unbroken front, demanding of her our just rights, and by this means, securing ourselves from further outrage, preserve and perpetuate in its original purity the union of the States; for this we are denounced as traitors.

The principles of the States Rights party are the principles of liberty and equality. A union of equality is the kind of union we will preserve, this is the kind of Union we will have or we will have none at all. A Union based upon any other principle is not worth a wish, it is not worth preserving. It is not the wish or desire of the Southern party to destroy this Union and build upon its ruins a Southern confederacy, but so long as it is a Union of equal rights we will preserve it if possible. But when it ceases to be a Union of equality—when it no longer serves the purpose for which it was formed—when it is made an engine of oppression, we will no longer owe it any allegiance. It is the object of the States Rights party, by the united action of the whole South to restore the Union to its original purity to have our liberties and our property secure from any further aggression. When this is done, harmony and peace and prosperity will reign throughout the length and breadth of our wide spread land. Who then we ask, are the true friends of the Union? Those that quietly sit down and say not a word in defence of their constitutional rights? Who when Congress passes a law unjust and degrading to the South, say that it has become a part of the supreme law of the land, and as we good, orderly and law abiding people must submit to it, or those who are willing to unite in defence of their rights, when these rights have been trampled under foot, and disregarded by Congress, and to which they solemnly declare they will no longer submit